

250 *Mr. Carrington, Obituary Notice of Prof. Chevallier.* xxxiv. 5,

in *Orion* was very distinctly seen, with its well-known streamers, some of which remind me of the wreaths of smoke which issue from under an extinguisher when putting out the light of a candle.

*Morton House Observatory, Worcester,  
1874, March 11.*

---

*Remarks on the Obituary of the late Rev. Professor Temple Chevallier, B.D., Astronomische Nachrichten, 1968, and Monthly Notices, vol. xxxiv. No. 4, pp. 138, 139. By R. C. Carrington, Esq., F.R.S.*

In both publications there appears the same paragraph, nearly word for word, although the first is signed John J. Plummer and the last R. J. K. which I take to be R. J. Knight.\* I listened with much attention to the reading of the obituary by Mr. Dunkin, and should have risen to contradict the paragraph on the spot if I had heard it, but no, it was not read, and there was not anything in the report to which I could take exception. The paragraph is: "He was the first to institute in England the regular, continuous observation of the Solar Spots, which has since led to important results. The methods he employed in these observations were afterwards adopted by Mr. Carrington (at one time Observer at Durham), who has made a similar series of observations with marked success; and astronomers may perhaps feel disposed to regret that Mr. Chevallier's talents were too much occupied by clerical and professorial work to admit of the full development of his powers in the field of original research."

Now, I hold that Harriot was the "first to institute in England the regular, continuous observations of the Solar Spots," and he observed them from December 8, 1610, to January 18, 1613, as I know from having had his observations in my hands to copy at Petworth House, on September 12, 1857.

Secondly, I have to deny altogether the assertion, twice repeated, that "the methods employed by Professor Chevallier were those afterwards adopted by Mr. Carrington," for I left Durham finally on April 8, 1852, and it is recorded by me in my astrono-

\* This may probably be explained on the supposition that Mr. Plummer forwarded to the writer of the obituary notice some notes relating to Professor Chevallier's astronomical work at Durham, and that these notes were also incorporated in the communication sent by Mr. Plummer to the *Astronomische Nachrichten*. We may take this opportunity of remarking that at the January meeting, 1849, Professor Chevallier exhibited a volume containing diagrams and observations, the result of "the regular, continuous observation of the Solar Spots," on which he had been employed some time, and that he expressed his intention of presenting the volume to the Society after he had completed the series of observations. In conformity with this intention, Professor Chevallier presented, on July 2, 1851, his valuable series of observations, bound in two volumes, both of which are now in the Society's Library.—[EDITOR.]

March 1874. *Mr. Glaisher, Note on a Paper by Mr. Stone.* 251

mical journal that, on October 11, 1853, the idea first occurred to me "whilst out walking at Redhill," of taking advantage of the Sun's circularity in the manner which I afterwards adopted, and explained in the *Monthly Notices*, vol. xiv. p. 153, and vol. xv. p. 174. I quote the following from my published work, Preface, p. 2: "To carry out this plan, it was in the first place necessary to devise a new and more commodious method of observation than any hitherto adopted, and to lay altogether new foundations of method in recording, reducing, comparing, and discussing, for I unhesitatingly say that no observer would for any length of time have followed out any of the modes of observation previously practised."

---

*Note on a Paper by Mr. Stone, "On the Rejection of Discordant Observations."* By J. W. L. Glaisher, Esq.

Considering the tone of Mr. Stone's remarks in the *Monthly Notices* for November (vol. xxxiv. pp. 9-15), I felt myself justified in expressing with frankness what I thought with regard to his views and his criticisms on my own.

It was suggested to me that the paper containing these opinions—necessarily somewhat personal—should be withdrawn, and I was advised that the matter rest where it was, without further comment, a course which is, perhaps, the better. I have stated what my belief is in the *Monthly Notices* for April 1873 (vol. xxxiii. pp. 391-402); and have now only to ask the reader not to assume that I hold, because I offer no reply, all the opinions attributed to me by Mr. Stone, *e.g.* in reference to the investigation on pp. 14 and 15. I never held that the *h* of every observation was *à priori* equally likely to have any value from 0 to  $\infty$ , as I took the usual result as a first approximation. I will also ask any one who wishes to form an opinion on the subject in question to read Mr. Stone's paper in the *Supplementary Number* (vol. xxxiii. pp. 570-572), as well as that already referred to.

---

*Second Paper on the probable Variability of some of the Red Stars in Schjellerup's List (Astronomische Nachrichten, No. 1591).*  
By J. Birmingham, Esq.

(Communicated by Mr. Dunkin.)

At the last December meeting of the Society I had the honour of laying before it an account of the disappearance of No. 252 in the above Catalogue; and, while noticing certain pos-

T